

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: 5/12/2025

MICHAEL CORDERO ROMERO,

Plaintiff, : 1:25-cv-2857-GHW

ORDER

GOLDMAN SACHS BANK USA,

Defendant.

GREGORY H. WOODS, United States District Judge:

On April 28, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's decision to deny expedited discovery in aid of his application for preliminary injunctive relief. Dkt. No. 35. The Court has reviewed the parties' submissions and has determined that Plaintiff's motion does not provide a basis for the Court to reconsider its previous decision.

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule 6.3, which provides that the moving party shall set forth “the matters or controlling decisions which counsel believes the Court has overlooked.” “Reconsideration of a previous order by the Court is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.” *Ortega v. Mutt*, No. 14-cv-9703 (JGK), 2017 WL 1968296, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. May 11, 2017) (quoting *Anwar v. Fairfield Greenwich Ltd.*, 800 F. Supp. 2d 571, 572 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)). As such, reconsideration should be granted only when the moving party “identifies an intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.” *Robinson v. Disney Online*, 152 F. Supp. 3d 176, 185 (S.D.N.Y. 2016) (quoting *Kolel Beth Yechiel Mechil of Tartikov, Inc. v. YLL Irrevocable Trust*, 729 F.3d 99, 104 (2d Cir. 2013)) (internal quotation marks omitted).

“The standard for granting [a motion for reconsideration] is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court

overlooked—matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.” *Shrader v. CSX Transp. Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995); *see also Bartlett v. Tribeca Lending Corp.*, No. 18-cv-10279, 2019 WL 1595656, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 12, 2019) (noting that a party moving for reconsideration of a previous order must demonstrate that the Court overlooked “controlling law or factual matters” that had been previously put before it). “A motion to reconsider will not be granted where the moving party is merely trying to relitigate an already decided issue,” *Padilla v. Maersk Line, Ltd.*, 636 F. Supp. 2d 256, 258–59 (S.D.N.Y. 2009), because “reconsideration of a previous order by the Court is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of scarce judicial resources,” *R.F.M.A.S., Inc. v. Mimi So*, 640 F. Supp. 2d 506, 509 (S.D.N.Y. 2009) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Ultimately, “[t]he decision to grant or deny a motion for reconsideration rests within ‘the sound discretion of the district court.’” *U.S. Bank Nat'l Ass'n v. Triazex Asset Mgmt. LLC*, 352 F. Supp. 3d 242, 246 (S.D.N.Y. 2019) (quoting *Aczel v. Labonia*, 584 F.3d 52, 61 (2d Cir. 2009)).

The Court assumes the parties’ familiarity with the facts of this case. Plaintiff does not offer “intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error” regarding the Court’s denial of expedited discovery. *Robinson*, 152 F. Supp. 3d at 185. Instead, Plaintiff presents a completely new basis for discovery, which the Court finds is without merit. Therefore, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is denied.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962).

The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate the motion pending at Dkt. No. 35.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 12, 2025



GREGORY H. WOODS
United States District Judge